

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. At section 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-41, 43-45 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In the Office Action, it was argued that the specification does not adequately describe the invention. Specifically, it was argued that one having skill in the art would not have known how to analyze an electronic source document that is available on a network of computers to *determine* a referenced entity identified in the document.

It is respectfully submitted that a person skilled in the art of computers would know how to cause a computer to analyze an electronic source document to determine a referenced entity identified in the document. At page 4 of the specification, an example of the invention is provided. On page 4, lines 1-3 it states, "the invention scans a document, and matches it against a database of known individuals and organizations." It is respectfully submitted that one having skill in the art of computers would know from this description at least one manner of causing a computer to analyze an electronic source document to determine a referenced entity identified in the document.

In addition, Applicant would like to note the statements made at section 14 of the office action dated December 14, 2004. In the December 14, 2004 office action, Hedloy was cited, and it was argued that Hedloy discloses a method of selecting contact information in which a document is analyzed to determine a referenced entity identified in the document. The 35 U.S.C 112

rejection in the Office Action, and the statements made on December 14, 2004 are at odds with each other. If the arguments presented in the prior paragraph are not sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection, then it is requested that the examiner reconsider Hedloy and decide whether the December 14, 2004 statements regarding Hedloy obviate the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection. If the arguments presented in the prior paragraph and reconsideration of Hedloy does not remove the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection, then it is respectfully requested that a detailed explanation of the relevance of Hedloy be provided.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made. The claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that no fee is due with this Response. If a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2442. Further, Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to file this Response. However, if an extension of time is needed, please consider this as a petition for an extension of time necessary to enter this Response.

The Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney if any questions remain following review of this response. If it will help, the undersigned is willing to explain by telephone or in person, the reasons the claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Kent Roberts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,786

Date: October 6, 2005

Hodgson Russ LLP
One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, NY 14203-2391
Telephone: (716) 856-4000